



Word repeats as unit ends

Discourse Studies
13(3) 367–380

© The Author(s) 2011

Reprints and permission: sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1461445611402749

dis.sagepub.com

SAGE

Emanuel A. Schegloff

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

Abstract

Turns-at-talk are fundamental units of participation in talk-in-interaction, and turn-constructive units (TCUs) are the basic building blocks for turns. Possible completion of a TCU is, in principle, the possible completion of the turn, but multi-unit turns are not uncommon, and participants have practices for constructing multi-unit turns and for recognizing them in the course of their production. This article offers an account of one practice (and several of its variants) usable by speakers and recipients to convey and recognize the designed completion of a multi-TCU turn and/or a multi-turn sequence in which ‘answering’ is being done: returning to, or ‘re-using’, a word or phrase from the start of the turn or sequence, whether articulated by same or different speaker, whether used to refer to same or different referents. This practice is one of the resources by which the overall structural organization of an interactional unit and its local realization are mutually realized.

Keywords

multi-unit turns, sequence closure, turn-constructive units (TCUs), turns

Let me begin with some data, and the observation which gave rise to the analysis and conclusions reported in the remainder of this article. The exchange presented in Extract (01) serves as the beginning of a telephone call between Marsha (Msh) and Tony (Tny), a separated or divorced couple, Tony living in northern California, Marsha in southern California. Their high school-aged son Joey lives with his father, but has driven down to visit his mother over a ‘long weekend’. On the day Joey is scheduled to return home, Tony calls Marsha and the conversation begins as follows:¹

(01) MDE: MTRAC:60-1:2

00 ((ring))

01 Msh: Hello:?

Corresponding author:

Emanuel A. Schegloff, Department of Sociology, 264 Haines Hall, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1551, USA.
Email: schegloff@soc.ucla.edu

- 02 Tny: H_i: Marsha?
- 03 Msh: Ye:ah.
- 04 Tny: How are you.
- 05 Msh: Fi::ne.
- 06 (0.2)
- 07 Msh: Did Joey get home yet?
- 08 Tny: → Well I wz wondering when ‘e *left*.
- 09 (0.2)
- 10 Msh: ‘hhh Uh:(d) did Oh: .h Yer not in on what ha:ppen’. (hh)(d)
- 11 Tny: No(h)o=
- 12 Msh: =He’s flying.
- 13 (0.2)
- 14 Msh: En Ilene is going to meeet im:. Becuz the to:p wz ripped
- 15 off’v iz car which is tih say someb’dy helped th’mselfs.
- 16 Tny: Stolen.
- 17 (0.4)
- 18 Msh: Stolen.=Right out in front of my house.
- 19 Tny: Oh: f’r crying out loud,=en eez not g’nna eez not
- 20 g’nna bring it ba:ck?
- 21 Msh: ‘hh No so it’s parked in the g’rage cz it wz so damn
- 22 co:ld. An’ ez a > matter fact < snowing on the Ridge Route.
- 23 (0.3)
- 24 Msh: ‘hhh So I took him to the airport he couldn’ buy a ticket.
- 25 (·)
- 26 Msh: ‘hhhh Bee- he c’d only get on standby.
- 27 (0.3)
- 28 Tny: Uh hu: [h,
- 29 Msh: → [En I *left* him there et abou:t noo:n.
- 30 (0.3)
- 31 Tny: Ah ha:h.
- 32 (0.2)
- 33 Msh: Ayund uh,h
- 34 (0.2)
- 35 Tny: W’t’s ‘e g’nna do go down en pick it up later? er
- 36 somethin like () [well that’s aw]:ful
- 37 Msh: [H i s friend]

Starting at line 12, Marsha is telling Tony ‘what happened’ in response to his ‘wondering when he [Joey] left’; she is, then, doing ‘answering’.

There are several interventions by Tony – to register, and perhaps check, his understanding of exactly what happened to the car (‘stolen’, at line 16) and to track its future (‘he’s not going to bring it back?’, at lines 19–20), interventions which end with Marsha’s returning the talk to more ‘telling what happened’, to more ‘answering’ (lines 21 ff.). As Marsha brings a succession of ‘turn-constructural units’ (TCUs; Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 1996) to possible completion (lines 22, 24, 26), Tony does not find them to be points of possible completion of the telling or answering; he does not treat them as places for possible transition to him as next speaker (‘transition relevance places’ or TRPs). He either does not intervene further at all (lines 23, 25, 27), or he does so with a continuer

(‘uh huh’), designed to show his understanding that a larger unit of talk is in progress and is not yet complete (Schegloff, 1982). After each of these TRPs with no transition to a next speaker, Marsha in fact produces a recognizable continuation of the telling.

When she is done (as is displayed by her report of departure from the scene at line 29), Tony does not quite recognize it as such; he responds (line 31) in a way that is hearable as another continuer, that may reflect an orientation to her previous re-turns to the telling. Having been apparently provided an opportunity for a further continuation in the face of her designed completion, Marsha resorts to the use of a weak ‘re-completer’ (the ‘and-uh’ at line 33) to re-display that she is done (Schegloff, 2009). This Tony recognizes, as he shows by in fact effecting a speaker transition, and taking up again (at line 35) one of his earlier interventions (lines 19–20) which had gotten short shrift the first time around (line 21, the first word).

There has been some issue, then, about Marsha’s recognizably ending the ‘answering’, and the telling which is implementing it. So how does Marsha in fact do ‘ending’ it? The utterance which does it, which appears to have been *designed* to do it – the TCU after which she does not have anything further to add when there is a chance to do so – is ‘En I left him there et about noo:n.’ How does this do ‘ending’?

Various features play a part in this design, not least of which is reporting the departure of the witness/reporter, who accordingly has nothing further to report. But the one that is the focus here is *the appearance in this concluding TCU of an element that had occurred in the question that had occasioned the telling which was its answer*. That element is ‘left’.

Now the ‘left’ in line 29 is quite different in various ways from the ‘left’ in line 8. For example, the one at line 8 is the ‘left’ of ‘departing’, and the one doing it is Joey. The one in line 29 is the ‘left’ of ‘abandoning’ and the one doing it is Marsha. The first is intransitive, the second transitive, so they are different semantically, pragmatically and grammatically. These ‘left’s figure quite differently in their respective utterances, have a different semantic import in context in spite of an arguably common semantic core (‘leaving’). And yet, however implausibly, it seems that the reappearance of the word – these differences to the contrary notwithstanding – can serve to tie the TCU in which it occurs back to the place in which it relevantly appeared before, and by returning to the start, can serve to mark a proposed end – that is, this response is proposedly complete.² And when Tony does not follow his registering of it with a full-fledged turn of his own, Marcia’s ‘And uh’, a re-completion, re-exiting device (see Schegloff, 2009) shows (shows *Tony*, in the first instance) that she meant to be done; given an opportunity to say more, she has no more to say.

The upshot of the observation, then, is that there is a practice for showing that some TCU of a multi-unit turn is meant to be its last, and that is to repeat an element from the turn’s start and/or (as here) the sequence’s start. But why should there be such a practice at all? Analytically speaking, what is the ‘problem’ to which such a practice may be addressed?

In the first instance, *turn* ending is grounded in *TCU* ending. As best we have been able to make out, parties to conversation gauge the possibility of a current turn’s possible completion by the possible completion of the current turn-constructional unit (TCU). This begins, of course, with the first TCU. At *its* first possible completion, parties assess whether or not someone has been selected to speak next, and if so, that speaker should begin a next turn at that point. If not, anyone may self-select; or the just-prior speaker

may continue. If the prior speaker continues, the continuation may be built as more of the same TCU (an ‘increment’; Schegloff, 1996), and the same set of contingencies reapplies at the *next* possible completion of the TCU. If the speaker continues with a *new* TCU, then the same set of contingencies reapplies at the first possible completion of the *new* TCU. All of this is, by now, familiar stuff from the turn-taking paper (Sacks et al., 1974); it is this set of practices which underlies the interactional mechanism that operates to constrain turn size.

But what I am calling attention to here is that the technology – the set of practices – that operates for turn completion is one which is basically a technology for TCU completion. Once the possible end of the TCU is not, ipso facto, a possible end of the turn, then how/when/where the turn will be ended is displaced from the TCU ending per se. More precisely, it is *supplemented* by other considerations, because the turn ending will virtually always be at a TCU ending, but which one?

Now a prime suspect here is the activity. When the *activity* being done in a turn – accounting, excusing, apologizing, complaining, etc. – is done, the turn in which it is implemented will be possibly done. If the turn is a second-pair-part turn, for example, and follows a question, then the answering turn will be possibly complete when the activity or action of answering is recognizably complete.

But what if some possible ends – of activity and TCU and hence turn – have already proved *not* to be the end or have not been recognized as such? The organization of the TCU is of course still relevant, as is the trajectory of the action or activity to possible completion, but they may not be enough. And here then there is another possibility – practices to do ‘ending the answering turn’. One way a speaker can show, and a recipient can figure, that a course of answering is proposedly finished and its turn possibly complete is by the repeating of a word or other relevant element from the question being answered. Brief examinations of several additional data extracts are meant to further ground and elaborate this proposal.

As Extract (02) (which picks up where Extract [01] ended) shows, an answer turn can repeat in its first (or designedly only) TCU elements of the question to which it is a response.

(02) MDE:MTRAC:60-1:2 (#11)

- 01 Tny:--> W't's 'e g'nna do go **down** en pick it **up** later? er
 02 somethin like () [well that's aw]:ful
 03 Msh: [H i s f r i e n d]
 04 Msh: Yeh h[is f r i e n d Stee-]
 05 Tony: [That really makes] me ma:d,
 06 (0.2)
 07 Msh: 'hhh Oh it's disgusti[ng ez a matter a'f]a:ct.
 08 Tny: [P o o r J o e y,]
 09 Msh: I- I, I told my ki:ds. who do this: down et the Drug
 10 Coalition ah want th'to:p back.h 'hhhhhhhhh ((1.0 breath))
 11 SEND OUT the WO:RD.hhh hnh
 12 (0.2)
 13 Tny: Yeah.

- 14 Msh: 'hhh Bu:t u-hu:ghh his friend Steve en Brian er driving
 15 --> **up**. Right after:: (0.2) school is out.En then hi'll
 16 --> drive **do:wn** here with the:m.
 17 Tny: Oh I see.
 18 Msh: So: in the long run, 'hhh it (·) probly's gonna save a
 19 liddle time 'n: energy.
 20 Tny: Okay,
 21 Msh: But I|e:ne probably (0.8) is either at the airport er
 22 waiting tuh hear fr'm in eess

At lines 01–02 Tony returns to the issue of 'getting the car back' which he had raised at lines 19–20 in Extract (01) and which had been given short shrift by Marsha at line 21. But, before Marsha can finish the response which she begins (Extract [02], line 03), Tony adds another TCU to his turn (line 02), an assessment of what 'has happened', which makes a second assessment relevant next (Pomerantz, 1984). The assessment sequence ends at line 13, and is followed by a return by Marsha to the reply (previously launched and aborted at lines 03 and 04) to Tony's question at lines 01–02. Note then the re-use in Marsha's answering turn of the directional markers 'up' and 'down' which figured in Tony's question. Here, however, they figure in what is analyzably a single turn-constructural unit with two increments, but in an answer which has been displaced from next-turn position by the burst of dismay at lines 02–13. The adjacent positioning which ordinarily underwrites the connection of response to the turn that occasioned it here is buttressed by ties of lexical composition.

In Extract (03), a multi-unit answer (lines 05–18 answer the topic-proffering question at line 04) gets expanded by the participants exchanging complaints about a former teacher, with the recipient of the question moving to close the sequence by including in her designedly final TCU elements from the Q ('get/got rid of' at the arrows marked 'a'). What is added here to Extract (01), which also exhibited this observation, is the extension of the sequence beyond the 'answering' made relevant by the question.

(03) TG 4:35-5:28 (#12)

- 01 Bee: Eh-yih have anybuddy: thet uh:? (1.2) I would know
 02 →b from the English depar'mint **there**?
 03 Ava: Mm-mh. Tch! I don't think so.
 04 Bee:→a °Oh,=<Did **they geh ridda** Kuhleznik yet hhh
 05 Ava: No in fact I know somebuddy who ha:s huh [now.
 06 Bee: [Oh my got hh[hhh
 07 Ava: [Yeh
 08 en s' he siz yihknow he remi:nds me of d-hih-ih- tshe
 09 reminds me, 'hhh of you, meaning me:
 10 (0.4)
 11 Bee: Uh-ho that's [a- that's a s[wee:t co:mplimint,] 'hh-
 12 Ava: [-Kuhleznik.= [=I said gee:, tha:n]ks a
 13 lo:[t honeh,
 14 Bee: [hhhhhuh huh=
 15 Ava: ='hh [Said] yih all gonna gitch' mouth shuddup fih you=

- 16 Bee: [ˈhɦɦɦ!]
 17 Ava: =yih don't sto:p i[t.]
 18 Bee: [°M]mmyeh,
 19 Bee: I think evrybuddy's had her hm[hɦɦ!
 20 Ava: [Ohh, [she's the biggest=]
 21 Bee: [-fih something,]
 22 Ava: =pain in the a:ss.
 23 (0.3)
 24 Bee: °Yeh,
 25 Ava: .T She's teaching uh English Lit too, no more composition,
 26 Bee: Oh:::, She's moved up in the wor[ld]
 27 Ava: [She] must know somebuddy
 28 →a because all those other teachers *they got rid of*.hɦɦɦ
 29 (0.3)
 30 Bee:→a Yeh I bet *they got rid of* all the one::Well one I had, t!
 31 'hɦɦɦ in the firs' term there, fer the firs'term of
 32 English, she die::d hɦuh-uhh [ˈhɦɦ
 34 Ava: [Oh:.
 35 Bee: She died in the middle of the te:rm?mɦɦɦ!=
 36 Ava: =Oh that's too ba:d hɦa ha!=
 37 Bee: =Eh-ye:h, ih-a, She wz rea:lly awful, she ha-duh, ('hh)
 38 she's the wuh- She ha:duh southern accent too.
 39 Ava: Oh:.
 40 Bee: A:nd, she wz very difficul'tuh unduhstand.
 41 Ava:→b No, she ain't there anymoh,
 43 Bee: No I know I mean she, she's gone a long t(h)ime
 44 (h)a'rea(h)[dy? hh
 45 Ava: [Mm, [hɦɦɦ!
 46 Bee: [ˈhɦɦ

But there is another thing to be noticed here in Extract (03). At lines 30–2, Bee appears to be aligning with Ava's move to close the sequence, by agreeing with its proposition (and using its wording – 'get/got rid of'). But at the last moment, she veers away by 'discovering' an exception – one who was got rid of not by 'them' but by HIM ('she died'). And Bee then extends this talk past the conclusion to which Ava had almost brought it. Once a closing has been re-directed into resumption, all bets are off, for it can again touch off new lines of talk. So it is worth registering here how Ava 'ties it off' (to use a surgical metaphor for bleeding) again – with her utterance at line 41.

This is, on the face of it, a very odd utterance. In the preceding 10 lines, Ava has given no evidence of knowing anything about the teacher whom Bee is remembering. And in Bee's indecision (at lines 37–8) about how to recipient-design a reference to this teacher when speaking to Ava, she opts for Ava NOT knowing the teacher ('she had a southern accent too') over knowing her ('she's the wuh . . .').³ So here is Ava (at line 41) knowing nothing about this teacher other than what Bee has just told her saying 'No'. 'No' what?! No, she wasn't very difficult to understand? That was the just prior turn. Of course not. The 'no' is followed by a clue on where to find the thing that this 'no' is addressing (see the arrows at 'b') – is perhaps answering; 'She ain't *there* anymore' goes back to the first

topic proffer ventured by Bee at line 01 and rejected by Ava out of hand, without a moment's thought at line 03 – the topic proffer asking whether there was 'anybody that I would know from the English Department *there*'. (And note that Bee has just identified the teacher who died as someone she 'had for the first term of English'.)

Why linger on this? Because the answerer of the original questions at lines 01 and 04 is using the same practice for invoking cloture (so to speak) even where the most recent multi-unit turn speaker was not her, but was instead the original question initiator. So the practice of returning to words from the question starts to look like not only a practice for ending *answering*, or ending *answering turns*, but a practice for *ending sequences*.

We return to this possibility below, but first, one other accretion to the practice being proposed.

As Extract (04) shows, the incipient ending of an answer can be displayed by a repeat of an element from the *very start of the answering turn* – its first TCU, *without that having been part of the question*; and indeed one may then be alert to the possibility that an answerer might begin an answer with such a thing as might be repeated to display ending or the imminence of ending.

Extract (04) is taken from a pre-dinner conversation between hosts Kathy (Kth) and husband Dave (Dav) and long-time friends Frieda (Frd) and her husband Reuben (Rbn). Kathy has recently taken up weaving as an avocation (she is otherwise a graduate student), and Frieda has just noticed one of Kathy's weavings, and has (at line 01) complimented her on it. Rather than deflecting or minimizing the compliment (the preferred response; see Pomerantz, 1978), Kathy has ratified it, albeit with a downgraded complimentary term ('nice' in place of 'beautiful'), and then undertakes to rectify this mild gaffe by minimizing the skill represented by the weaving (line 04 ff.).

(04) KC-4, 16:7-17:2 (#2)

- 01 Frd: that is [beautiful
 02 Kth: [‘n that nice
 03 Rbn: Yah it really is
 04 Kth: → it wove itself once it was set up=
 05 Frd: =its wool?
 06 Kth: Its wool
 07 (0.8)
 08 Rbn: → Whaddyou mean it wove itself once it w’s set up.
 09 → [what d’s that mean
 10 Kth: [Oh I-
 11 Kth: → → Well I mean *it’s very simple*,
 12 (0.8)
 13 Kth: it’s exact[ly the same in the weft as it is in the warp
 14 Dav: [She also means th’t
 15 Kth: That is if the warp has sixteen greens an two blacks an
 16 two light blues and two blacks an sixteen greens an
 17 sixteen blacks an sixteen blues an so on y’know, the
 18 warp are tha long pieces.
 19 Frd: mhhm

- 20 Kth: The weft has exactly that
 21 Frd: Yah
 22 Rbn: Oh. So [its square, in other words.
 23 Kth: [(ya see?)
 24 Kth: It's perfectly square yah. So once I'd set up the warp, (0.8)
 25 →→ *it was very simple* to jus keep, jus ta weave it.

In response to Reuben's asking what she means by 'wove itself' (line 04), Kathy starts with the summary descriptor 'very simple' (line 11), and ends her account – or, better, shows she is ending her account – by repeating that summary term (line 25).

Putting the pieces together, imminent ending of an answering (or of a sequence that was engendered by a turn that made answering relevant) can incorporate elements from both the question being addressed and the start of the answer to it, as in Extract (05), taken from an interview on National Public Radio in 1998.

- (05) NPR, Morning Edition, 2/18/98 interview between Renee Montagne (IR) and 'famous' cookie baker Maida Heatter

- 01 IR: Is there something about:(·) cooking and even: eating
 02 → (0.5)cookies. (·) that has a *therapeutic* quality to it?
 03 MH:→ -Well I don't know if this is: *answering* your question
 04 but I would like to tell you thet 'hhh maybe five six seven
 05 years ago, I fell an' I broke my a:rm. 'hh And uh (0.5)
 06 went to a doctor en: he set it, 'n then at one point I
 07 was supposed to 'hhh move my arm en it was very painful.
 08 'hh I was in his office (·) en he said "Now move your arm
 09 o- put your hand out" en I did it. It
 10 hurt, but I did it. An he said "That's amazing," an he
 11 said "Just wait here." An' he called a young man in. This
 12 young man was a leading football player on the Miami
 13 football team. And he had broken his arm. At about the
 14 same time that I had my accident. He told the young man
 15 'hh to move his arm. The young man said "I can"t. It
 16 hurts" heh heh heh But I did it. And the doctor said it
 17 was because of all the exercise I had had over the years
 18 with a rolling pin, rolling out dough that my arm was
 19 stronger than this young man football player's. huh huh
 20 → So if- if that's *therapeutic* I: think the *answer* is "yes."

Here, 'therapeutic' comes from the question (at line 02) and 'answer' comes from the start of the response (at line 03, and the package is thereby wrapped up.⁴

Let me end by offering additional evidence that this practice of moving to close by returning to an element of the start *does* extend to closing *sequences* and not only answers, and not only to second parts of question/answer sequences, and can do so over substantially greater distances than we have yet examined. This is Extract (06), which, despite its length, is only about half of the actual sequence (it lasts four minutes and constitutes the last quarter of this conversation; several long exchanges in the middle

have been omitted, marked after line 82). The participants are the same young women as figured in Extract (03). The focus will be on lines 168–80. The letters attached to arrows to the left of the text provide guidance on the threads running through this spate of talk which connect recurrences of words and phrases (marked by italics and boldface) that tie elements of the sequence to one another (the reader is invited to look at the a-marked turns, the b-marked turns, etc. to track these threads).

This is not a simple asking and telling sequence; it is an arrangements-making sequence, and one in which the young women are tugging in opposite directions, each playing hard to get in turn as the other takes the initiative to propose getting together. Having been at loggerheads all conversation long and not only in this sequence, they here collaborate in closing the conversation – each contributing part of the utterance which they thereby collaboratively replay to mark the closure at lines 178–9.

(06) TG 15:15-20:07

- 01 Bee: **a** → °hmhhh 'hh So *yih gonna be arou:n* this weeken'z
 02 Ava: **b** → *Uh::m. (0.3) Possibly.*
 03 Bee: Uh it's a four day weeken-I have so much work t'do it
 04 isn' ffunn[y].
 05 Ava: [Well, tomorrow I haftuh go in.
 06 (0.2)
 07 Bee: Y'have cla:ss [tomorrow?
 08 Ava: [hhh
 09 Ava: ((breathily)) One cla:ss I have.=
 10 Bee: =You mean:: Pace isn't clo:s[ed?
 11 Ava: [No we have off
 12 Monday [°(b't not) 'hhh
 13 Bee: [Mm I have off ts- Monday too. hmfff
 14 Ava: A:nd uh:m 'hh I haftuh help- getting some schedules
 15 t'gether fuh- m-t! [my o:ld Mistuh Ba:rt.
 16 Bee: ['hhh
 17 Bee: °Hmmm.
 18 Ava: A:nd I haftuh get the group tihgethuh fuh him.hh
 19 (0.5)
 20 Ava: t! tch!
 21 Bee: BOY YUH BUSY KID! hh 'hhh
 22 Ava: Yeh I know.He gay me [tickets t'the ballet in d=
 23 Bee: [hh 'hhh
 24 Ava: =exchange fuh that, so it['s not too] bad.
 25 Bee: [O h :] hh
 26 Bee: Busy busy [busy.]
 27 Ava: [°hhhhh]
 28 Ava: A::nd,
 29 Ava: hhh[hh
 30 Bee: [Oh I've been [getting,]
 31 Ava: [S a t]ihday I n- I've-g-I haftuh
 32 go- I think Sunday I'm going ice skating.

- 33 (1.2)
- 34 Ava: I wz sposetuh go tuh A:lbany. But we'd haftuh leave
35 t'morrow morning, so that wen ou:t. the window,
36 Bee: °Mm,
37 (1.0)
- 38 Ava: **b** → *En I don't know exagly what's going o:n.refally.*
39 Bee: **a** → [Well if
40 **a** → *yer arou:nd* I'll probably see y(hh)ou hn[hh! 'hh
41 Ava: [Why, whut's
42 (Bob doing)
43 Bee: Uh-u-uh:: goin o:ff::
44 Ava: Where's he goin.
45 Bee: To Wa:shin'ton,
46 Ava: Oh.
47 (0.7)
- 48 Bee: He asn' been there sih-since Christmas [so:. hHe's going.
49 Ava: [Mm.
50 (0.5)
- 51 Ava: **c** → *Yeh w'l I'll give you a call then tomorrow.when I get*
52 *in 'r sumn.*
53 (0.5)
- 54 Bee: Wha:t,
55 Ava: **c** → *<I'll give yih call tomofrrow.]*
56 Bee: [Yeh:] 'n [I'll be ho:me t'mor]row.
57 Ava: **c** → [*When I-I get home.*] I
58 Ava: **c** → don't kno-w- *I could be home by-'hh three, I c'd be home*
59 *by two [I don't] know.]*
60 Bee: **d** → [Well] when]ever. I'll poh I-I might go *t'the*
61 **d** → *city in the mo:rning anyway,*
62 Ava: [It depends on how (tough the)=So
63 **d** → what time *y'leaving f'the city,*
64 Bee: Oh:: probly abou-t te[n=
65 [((ringing sound in background))
66 Bee: **e** → =*ten thirty* eleven, er-[n-d-ih-] 'hh]
67 Ava: **d** → [O h] if you wanna] *leave* about
68 **f** → e]even [*I'll walk down with] [you.*]°Cz I haftuh go] t'school]
69 [((ringing sound in b) [ackg]round))]
70 Bee: [I t] de p en :d s] how I ro:]l
71 outta bed tom(h)orr(h)uh!['hh!]
72 Ava: [Well] le'[s see-eh-so]=
73 Bee: [how I fee:l.] hh
74 Ava: **c,e** → =*lemme give you a call about ten thi:rdy.*
75 Bee: 'hh Yeeuh.
76 Ava: [A'ri:ght?]
77 Bee: [I'll see] w'ts-
78 Bee: Yeah. [°See w h a t ' s g o i n g o:n.]
79 Ava: [Maybe you wanna come downtuh school] see what
80 the new place looks like,
81 (0.5)

- 82 Bee: Yih may:be.
 .
 . ((+2 minutes/85 lines of transcript omitted)
 .
- 168 Bee: °Mmmm. Tch! 'hh WE:ll, hmff tch!=
- 169 Bee: [Awright so,
- 170 Ava: **c** → [Well if you wan' me (to) *give you a ring tomorrow morning*.
- 171 Bee: Tch! 'hhh We:ll y-you know, let's, eh- I don'know, I'll
- 172 Bee: see (h)may[be I woon' even be in,]
- 173 Ava: [Well when yih go intuh] the city y'gonna
- 174 haftuh walk down t'the train a[n y w a y.]
- 175 Bee: [r-Ri:ght.]
- 176 Ava: **f** → *So might ez well walk with some[buddy]*. 'hh
- 177 Bee: [Right. So I'll s-Aright.
- 178 **c** → *so gimme a call,*
- 179 Ava: **e** → *Bout ten thirdy.*
- 180 Bee: Ri:ght.
- 181 Ava: Okay th[en.
- 182 Bee: [[A'right.
- 183 Ava: [A'ri [ght.
- 184 Bee: [Tch![I'll (s-)/(t-) I'll talk tihyou then t'mor[row.
- 185 Ava: [O:kay.=
- 186 Bee: =Okay [buh buy,
- 187 Ava: [Bye bye.

The first round of this undertaking is initiated by Bee (the caller) at line 01 with a question designed to launch an arrangements sequence with a pre-sequence (Schegloff, 2007) exploring recipient's availability, projecting some form of arrangement-proposal contingent on the response. The response (at line 02) is not promising; it neither invites a proposal nor precludes one, but hedges – a response which elicits from Bee potential obstacles on her part as well (lines 03–04). What follows (lines 05–37) is a detailing by Ava of all of her plans and commitments for the long (holiday) weekend ahead, summarized (at line 38) by a reassertion of the hedged position articulated as her initial response, thereby bringing her reply to the pre-arrangements to closure. At lines 39–40 Bee makes the best of this mixed but reluctant response by treating Ava's uncertainty as a given, and treating the prospect of getting together as a matter of chance – not exactly the proffer of an arrangement; there could hardly be a more indirect way of conveying 'I will be around too', and thereby alluding to the possibility of doing something together, but that is what Bee has, in effect, done. With that, Bee has sealed the completion of the pre-sequence, and we can note that, in doing so, she has re-used part of the lexicon she employed in launching that pre-sequence, 'being around', at the 'a' arrows in Extract (06).

Bee's base first-pair-part comes as something of a surprise to Ava, who had apparently supposed that Bee would be spending the time with her boyfriend, and inquires why that is not the case (lines 41–2). Positioned as it is after an attenuated proffer of doing something together, Ava's questions and Bee's replies (at lines 41–50, 'yeh') amount to an insertion sequence between Bee's first-pair-part and Ava's pending second-pair-part response, on which that response will be contingent. The outcome is as surprising to Bee

as Bee's first-pair-part was to Ava: Ava proposes (lines 51–2) to take the initiative in getting in touch with Bee, a proposal on which Bee initiates repair (line 54), though the utterance was clearly articulated. The elements of Ava's turns at the 'c' arrows will figure in the remainder of this sequence.

Now that Ava has proposed to take the initiative in contacting Bee, it is Bee who plays hard to get. Although she at first replies to Ava's undertaking to call her 'tomorrow when I get in' by saying that she will be home (line 56), a moment later – while Ava is explaining why she cannot be more specific about the time she could call – she (Bee) says she might actually *not* be home because she might be going 'to the city' (i.e. into Manhattan – where Ava goes to school). Ava changes her stance mid-utterance (lines 62–3) from explaining the timing of her calling the next day in the afternoon to arrange a get-together to what amounts to an inquiry about when Bee plans to go into the city – clearly a pre-sequence to a proposal to go the city together (see the proposal at line 68 to walk to the train together). Now it is Bee who will not be pinned down to a specific time (lines 64–6, 70–1, 73). And at line 79, Ava becomes the FPP speaker with a proposal that Bee come to the new college campus with her – the first of a half dozen such proposals that follow, none of which elicits any alignment from Bee (in the 82 lines and over two minutes deleted from the data segment provided in the text). When Bee (at lines 168–9) launches a possible pre-closing sequence (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973), Ava responds with a reprise of her proposal to call Bee in the morning, using virtually the same words used earlier in the 'c'-marked turns, and this closing-situated sequence is composed of the same elements that figured in its launching and which now mark the closing with a preferred response to Ava's proposal.

So finally, an upshot. The practice of 'returning to the beginning', and to the auspices of launching, is surely familiar to us from elsewhere. It is one way in which those who initiated a conversation may launch its closing section, and it has thereby figured in what we have called in the past (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973) 'the overall structural organization of the unit "a single conversation"'. One upshot of the evidence we have been reviewing here is the proposal that we recognize 'overall structural organization' not as something for the unit 'a single conversation' (or encounter, or session, etc.) alone, but for units like turns, actions and courses of action (like answering or telling), sequences, and who knows what else as well. And here perhaps is the – or an – alternative to 'local organization'. CA work has so often emphasized *local* organization that I have found myself from time to time asking myself 'as opposed to what?'. What would be something that is not local organization, but operates pretty much everywhere in interaction? Might it not be 'overall structural organization'?

Units or orders of organization of all sorts (or of only *many* sorts, perhaps) can have – perhaps *must* have – both: a local organization, which operates via progressivity from one sub-unit to a next, at various levels of granularity; and an overall structural organization. The latter, of course, can only get its work done in the places provided by the former. The former – the local organization – can only get its emergent shaping by reference to the latter – or the several 'latter's which operate on it – for example, the overall structural organization of TCUs, of turns, of sequences, of courses of action or activities such as telling or answering, of the unit 'a single conversation', and of that sprawling marvel

we call 'a continuing state of incipient talk' (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973: 325–6), as though we understood it.

Acknowledgments

Earlier versions of this work were presented at Meetings of the National Communication Association in New York City, NY in 1998, and in Boston, MA in 2005. My thanks to those whose responses to prior presentations have contributed to the result published here, and, most recently, to John Heritage and Gene Lerner.

Notes

1. Audio files of the data presented in this article can be accessed at: [<http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/>].
2. The observation about word selection's service to the organization of stretches of talk is surely not new; in the conversation-analytic literature see (inter alia) Jefferson (1996); Sacks (1973, 1992: Volume 1, on 'tying rules', and Volume 2 on 'poetics'); Schegloff (2003a, 2003b, 2005); and, in another tradition of work, Halliday and Hassan (1976).
3. Almost certainly this is on the way to 'she's the one who ...'.
4. For an account of the commonality of this practice, see Clayman and Heritage (2002).

References

- Clayman, S. and Heritage, J. (2002) *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Jefferson, G. (1996) 'On the Poetics of Ordinary Conversation', *Text and Performance Quarterly* 16(1): 1–61.
- Pomerantz, A. (1978) 'Compliment Responses: Notes on the Co-operation of Multiple Constraints', in J. Schenkein (ed.) *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, pp. 79–112. New York: Academic Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984) 'Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, pp. 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1973) 'On Some Puns with Some Intimations', in R.W. Shuy (ed.) *Report of the Twenty-third Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*, pp. 135–44. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-taking for Conversation', *Language* 50: 696–735.
- Sacks, H. (1992, 1995) *Lectures on Conversation*, Volumes I and II, G. Jefferson (ed.), Introduction by E. A. Schegloff. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1982) 'Discourse as an Interactional Achievement: Some Uses of 'Uh Huh' and Other Things that Come Between Sentences', in D. Tannen (ed.) *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1981; Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*, pp. 71–93. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1996) 'Turn Organization: One Intersection of Grammar and Interaction', in E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff and S.A. Thompson (eds) *Interaction and Grammar*, pp. 52–133. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Schegloff, E.A. (2003a) 'On ESP Puns', in P. Glenn, C. LeBaron and J. Mandelbaum (eds) *Studies in Language and Social Interaction: In Honor of Robert Hopper*, pp. 531–40. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2003b) 'The Surfacing of the Suppressed', in P. Glenn, C. LeBaron and J. Mandelbaum (eds) *Studies in Language and Social Interaction: In Honor of Robert Hopper*, pp. 241–62. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2005) 'Whistling in the Dark: Notes from the Other Side of Liminality', in S. Finch, T. Ikeda, M. Shetty and C. Sunakawa (eds) *Texas Linguistic Forum 48: Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Symposium about Language and Society – Austin*, pp. 17–30, Austin, Texas.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2007) *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2009) 'A Practice for (Re-)Exiting a Sequence: And/But/So + Uh(m) + Silence', in B. Fraser and K. Turner (eds) *Language in Life, and a Life in Language: Jacob Mey – A Festschrift*, pp. 365–74. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Schegloff, E.A. and Sacks, H. (1973) 'Opening Up Closings', *Semiotica* 8: 289–327.

Emanuel A. Schegloff has taught at Columbia University and the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), where he is currently Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Applied Linguistics, Emeritus. His work is focused on talk and other conduct in interaction as the primordial site of sociality.